

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

LETTERS PATENT APPEAL No 91 of 1995

in

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 2652 of 1992

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKER and
MR.JUSTICE S.D.PANDIT

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed
to see the judgements? NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? NO @@ t
e Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter
r not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ th
Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter o
not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the
Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO
@@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the Reporter or
not? NO @@ the Reporter or not? NO @@ the
eporter or not? NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy
of the judgement? NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil
Judge? NO

ASHWINBHAI S MEHTA

Versus

Appearance:

MR PB MAJMUDAR for Petitioner

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKER and

MR.JUSTICE S.D.PANDIT

Date of decision: 23/04/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT

This Letters Patent Appeal is against the order passed by the learned Single Judge in Special Civil Application No. 2652 of 1992 decided on December 20, 1993. The appellant is petitioner-employee. Regular Departmental Inquiry was held against the appellant and had proceeded in accordance with law. At the conclusion of the Inquiry, the appellant was found guilty of all the charges levelled against him and based upon the said findings, Disiplinary Authority had issued show-cause notice, and ultimately, passed an order imposing penalty of compulsory retirement from the services of Bank.

Thereafter, appellant preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority, which came to be dismissed vide Order dated April 20, 1991. Being aggrieved by the said Order, appellant preferred a writ petition, being Special Civil Application No. 2652 of 1992. Finding of facts have ben recorded by the learned Single Judge. On the basis of these findings, the learned Single Judge dismissed the petition. It cannot be said that the order against the appellant was contrary to law or otherwise unreasonable, arbitrary or perverse. Hence, Letters Patent Appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs.

Prakash*